

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time and attention to this application.

Applicant will respond to each objection in the order raised by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings and states that Figure 1 through Figure 9 contains improper shading which may affect clarity when reproduced. Applicant notes that there is no shading in Figures 1 and 9. Applicant has amended Figure 2 through Figure 9 to improve readability. No new subject matter was added by way of the amendment to the drawings. Applicant trusts that the Examiner agrees that Figures 1 to 9 are now formal.

Disclosure

The Examiner objects to the disclosure and states three informalities in the specification. Applicant has amended page 6 such that all instances of the reference numeral 14b describe a shopping cart managing module. Applicant has also amended page 9 such that all instances of the reference numeral 51 describe an advertisement statement. Finally, Applicant has amended page 9 such that all instances of the reference numeral 12 describe an Internet service providing system. No new subject matter was added by way of the above amendments to the disclosure. Applicant trusts the amendments satisfy the Examiner's objections.

Applicant has also made some voluntary amendments on pages 1, and 7-11 to correct some typographical errors, add clarity to the disclosure, and add reference numerals referenced in the drawings. No new subject matter was added by way of the voluntary amendment.

Claims

The application was originally filed with 23 claims. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6-10 and 14-15, cancelled claims 2, 5, 11, 12, 13, and 16-23, and added claims 24-39. No new subject matter was added by way of the amendments to the claims. All claims are fully supported by the disclosure.

The Examiner rejects claims 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicant has cancelled claims 16-23. New claims 28 to 39 correspond to cancelled claims 16 to 23. New claims 28 to 39 do not claim people. Applicant trusts that the Examiner agrees that claims 28-39 comply with 35 U.S.C. 101.

The Examiner rejects claims 2-15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15, cancelled claims 2, 5, 11, 12, 13, and 19, and added claims 24-27. Claim 24 includes action steps and claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 14, 15, and 25-27 are dependent upon claim 24. Applicant trusts that the Examiner agrees that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 14, 15, and 24-27 now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bezos U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Examiner provides detailed reasons with respect to each claim. Applicant traverses the Examiner's reasons and provides arguments explaining the differences between Bezos and the present application.

Claim 1

The Examiner claims that Bezos discloses a method of selling items comprising steps including providing a hyperlink. Applicant submits that Bezos provides a link that an affiliate can add to their web site, whereas Applicant's invention generates an entire affinity group web site which includes the hyperlink. Applicant has amended claim 1 to be

dependent upon new claim 24 to clarify this point. Moreover, new claims 25 to 27 are dependent upon revised claim 1.

Claim 2

The Examiner claims that Bezos discloses a method of promoting and selling the products and services of an e-tailing, including the step of providing a web site. With respect, Applicant submits that Bezos provides an e-tailing web site, but does not provide an affiliate web site. Rather, Bezos provides a hyperlink that an affiliate can add to their web site. In contrast, Applicant's invention generates an affinity group web site. Applicant has cancelled claim 2, amended claim 1, and added claim 24 to clarify this point.

Claim 3

The Examiner claims that Bezos further discloses a method comprising steps of packaging and delivering goods. Applicant notes that Bezos does not teach packaging member packages into group packages. Moreover, claim 3 is now dependent upon revised claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5

Claim 4 is now dependent upon revised claim 1, and claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claim 6

The Examiner states that Bezos further discloses a method wherein said Internet service comprising a step of assisting said group in establishing a Web site. Applicant respectfully notes that Bezos only provides an affiliate with a hyperlink and instructions regarding how to incorporate the hyperlink to an existing web site. By contrast, the present invention provides an affinity group with an entire web site. Claim 6 is now dependent upon new claim 24 that clarifies this point.

Claims 7, 8 and 9

The Examiner states that Bezos further discloses a method comprising a step of preparing and maintaining a plurality of Web sit frameworks, wherein said frame work is

designed to include said hyperlink, and wherein said framework is configured to guide and help said group to create said web site. Applicant respectfully notes that Bezos does not have even a single framework that is used as an architecture for creating web sites as Bezos does not teach a means for affiliates to create a web site. Figure 3b of Bezos shows a field for a potential affiliate to specify the URL of their web site as created and hosted by them. By contrast, Applicant's invention provides frameworks for users to select and modify in order to build a web site. The generated web site includes the hyperlink. Moreover, claims 7, 8 and 9 are now dependent upon new claim 24.

Claims 10 and 11

The Examiner states that Bezos further discloses a method wherein said hyperlink is embedded in said web site as an electronic store, and said electronic store includes an electronic store of said group. Applicant respectfully submits that Bezos does not provide a web site to an affiliate as Applicant's invention provides a web site to an affinity group. Figure 6 of Bezos refers to the affiliate's web site which has links to an electronic store, but is not an electronic store. The electronic store in Bezos is the same for all and is not an electronic store for the said group. Applicant has cancelled claim 11 and revised claim 10 to include the limitation of cancelled claim 11. Moreover, claim 10 is now dependent upon revised claim 1.

Claims 12 and 13

Applicant has cancelled claims 12 and 13.

Claim 14

The Examiner states that Bezos further discloses a method comprising a step of posting on said Web site an advertisement and information relating to said e-tailer. Applicant respectfully notes that Bezos does not provide a method for posting anything on a web site. Bezos merely provides the code that can be used by someone skilled in the art of "posting" to a web site. Moreover, claim 14 is now dependent upon revised claim 1.

Claim 15

Claim 15 is now dependent upon revised claim 1.

Claims 16-23

Claims 16-23 have been cancelled. New claims 28 to 39 correspond with claims 16-23. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28 to 39 are not anticipated by Bezos under the same rationale as set forth supra.

Thus, Applicant trusts that the Examiner agrees that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 14, 15, and 24-39 are not anticipated by Bezos and comply with 35 U.S.C. 102.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, and having dealt with all of the Examiner's objections, reconsideration and allowance is earnestly requested.

If any additional fees are required by this communication, please charge said fees to Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33477US1.

Respectfully submitted:

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: John P. Murtaugh
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, OH 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: 7-14-04